

NEW JERSEY MILITIA NEWSLETTER

Volume X, Issue No. 8

February 2005

All persons are by nature free and independent, and have certain natural and unalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and of pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness.

-- Article 1, Section 1, New Jersey State Constitution

It Can't Happen Here

By Rep. Ron Paul, MD

In 2002 I asked my House colleagues a rhetorical question with regard to the onslaught of government growth since 9-11: Is America becoming a police state?

The question is no longer rhetorical. We are not yet living in a total police state, but it is fast approaching. The atmosphere since 2001 has permitted Congress to create whole new agencies that purport to make us safer – always at the expense of our liberty. But security and liberty go hand-in-hand. A society with no constraints on its government cannot be secure. History proves that societies crumble when governments become more powerful than the people and private institutions.

Unfortunately, the new intelligence bill moves us closer to an encroaching police state by imposing the precursor to a full-fledged national ID card. Within two years, every American will need a "conforming" ID to deal with any federal agency – including TSA at the airport.

Undoubtedly many Americans and members of Congress don't believe America is becoming a police state. They associate the phrase with military patrols, martial law, and summary executions. But we ought to be concerned that we have laid the foundation for tyranny by making the public more docile, more accustomed to government bullying, and more accepting of arbitrary authority – all in the name of security. Our love for liberty has been so diminished that we tolerate intrusions into our privacy that would have been abhorred just a few years ago. We tolerate inconveniences and infringements upon our liberties in a manner that reflects poorly on our

great national character of rugged individualism, by empowering the federal government and its agents to run our lives.

Terror, fear, and crises like 9-11 are used to achieve complacency and obedience, especially when citizens are deluded into believing they are still free. The loss of liberty, we are assured, will be minimal. Many citizens believe that once the war on terror is over, restrictions on their liberties will be reversed. But this war is undeclared and open-ended, with no precise enemy and no expressly stated final goal. Terrorism will never be eradicated completely; does this mean future presidents will assert extraordinary war powers indefinitely?

Washington DC provides a vivid illustration of what our future might look like. Visitors to Capitol Hill encounter police barricades, metal detectors, paramilitary officers carrying fully automatic rifles, police dogs, ID checks, and vehicle stops. The people are totally disarmed; only the police and criminals have guns. Surveillance cameras are everywhere. There's not much evidence of an open society in Washington, DC, yet most folks do not complain.

After all, proponents argue, if you don't have anything to hide, what are you so afraid of? The answer is that I'm afraid of losing the last vestiges of privacy that a free society should hold dear. I'm afraid of creating a society where the burden is on citizens to prove their innocence, rather than on government to prove wrongdoing. Most of all, I'm afraid of living in a society where a subservient populace surrenders its liberties to an all-powerful government.

It may be true that average Americans do not feel intimidated by

the encroachment of the police state because they have been deluded into believing total government supervision is necessary and helpful, and because they still enjoy a high level of material comfort. That tolerance may wane, however, as our standard of living falls due to spiraling debt, endless deficit spending, a declining fiat dollar, inflation, higher interest rates, and failing entitlement programs. At that point attitudes toward omnipotent government may change, but the trend toward authoritarianism will be difficult to reverse.

Those who believe a police state can't happen here are poor students of history. Every government, democratic or not, is capable of tyranny. We must understand this if we hope to remain a free people.

U.N. Fires Critic

UNITED NATIONS — U.N. officials have decided not to renew the contract of a doctor who was the coauthor of a controversial memoir about life on the front lines of U.N. peacekeeping in the 1990s.

Andrew Thomson and two colleagues wrote "Emergency Sex and Other Desperate Measures: A True Story from Hell on Earth," published in June. The book reads like an illicit peek into the trio's diaries during a decade of adventure and angst.

It also delivers harsh judgments about the U.N., because genocides in Rwanda and Bosnia happened under the world organization's watch.

"If blue-helmeted U.N. peacekeepers show up in your town or village and offer to protect you, run," Thomson wrote. "Or else get weapons. Your lives are worth so much less than theirs."

Thomson's work with the world body included a two-year stint exhuming corpses for forensic evidence of war crimes.

U.N. staff members said that about two months ago, after Miramax TV had optioned the book, Deputy Secretary-General Louise Frechette sent the files of Thomson and one of his coauthors, Heidi Postlewait, to the personnel department with a note demanding action on the cases right away. The third author had already quit the U.N.

Tom Devine, legal director of the Government Accountability Project, which defends whistle-blowers like Thomson, said that the systemic problems that led to the genocides and other abuses have yet to be fully dealt with. In November, Secretary-General Kofi Annan publicly apologized for sexual abuse by U.N. peacekeepers and civilians in Congo, a problem that the authors described occurring in Cambodia in 1993 and Liberia in 1996.

Annan and his Cabinet are also under fire for not openly confronting complaints of sexual harassment and problems with the scandal-riven Iraq "oil-for-food" program.

The U.N.'s Staff Council recently passed a no-confidence vote on senior management, and an internal survey showed that employees felt they would not be protected if they blew the whistle on wrongdoing.

--Los Angeles Times, Dec. 15, 2004

Pro-Gun Prof Says Free Speech Denied

The issues of gun control and free speech dominate a lawsuit filed by an Oklahoma University professor who used a blunt sexual comparison to criticize a pro-gun control newspaper column and later was demoted for that and other perceived transgressions.

Geology professor David Deming wrote to the editor of the *Oklahoma Daily* in February 2000 arguing that the owner of an unregistered gun was no more likely to become a murderer than a woman who had not registered her sex organ was to becoming a prostitute.

The letter prompted 25 charges of sexual harassment against Deming, filed "by people I had never met," he stated in a subsequent column. And while those charges were eventually dropped, Deming believes the letter remained a sore spot for university officials, contributing to their

decision to oust him from the OU School of Geology and Geophysics, strip him of most of his classes and relocate his office to a basement lab.

--CNSNews.com Dec. 13, 2004

One Origin of Gun Laws

By Doug Fiedor

Americans should keep in mind that they have no "right" to be protected by the police. American police are reactive, not proactive. They rarely "prevent" crime. Usually they catch lawbreakers after the fact.

This was by design of the Founding Fathers. Because, as we see today with the anti-terrorism laws, in order to "prevent" crime, police would need all sorts of obnoxious powers that would trample all over our rights of life, liberty and property.

So Americans were intended to defend themselves. Put another way, the Constitution does not grant the federal government the authority to restrict Americans from keeping and bearing arms. Rather, the Second Amendment clearly instructs government agents that "the right of the people to keep and bear Arms shall not be infringed."

James Madison wrote in *The Federalist Papers* #46: "Americans have the right and advantage of being armed -- unlike the citizens of other countries whose governments are afraid to trust the people with arms."

Thomas Jefferson also recognized the need for citizens to be armed: "A strong body makes the mind strong. As to the species of exercises, I advise the gun. While this gives moderate exercise to the body, it gives boldness, enterprise, and independence to the mind. Games played with the ball and others of that nature, are too violent for the body and stamp no character on the mind. Let your gun therefore be the constant companion of your walks." (*Encyclopedia of T. Jefferson*, 318 [Foley, Ed., reissued 1967])

As late as the 1960s, Congress agreed that the American people have an inherent right to keep and bear arms. Even the most liberal Democrats recognized that right: "Certainly one of the chief guarantees of freedom under any government, no matter how popular and respected, is the right of the citizens to keep and bear arms. This is not to say that firearms should not be carefully used and that definite safety rules of precaution should not be taught and

enforced. But the right of the citizens to bear arms is just one guarantee against arbitrary government and one more safeguard against a tyranny which now appears remote in America, but which historically has proved to be always possible."

That was Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, later Vice President under L.B. Johnson.

Even in the 1980s U.S. Senators grudgingly admitted that a private citizen has the right to own and carry firearms. The Subcommittee on the Constitution of the Senate Judiciary Committee released its "Report on the Constitution," dated February, 1982: "The conclusion is thus inescapable that the history, concept, and wording of the second amendment to the Constitution of the United States, as well as its interpretation by every major commentator and court in the first half-century after its ratification, indicates that what is protected is an individual right of a private citizen to own and carry firearms in a peaceful manner."

So, what happened? If these Senators knew perfectly well that the American people have a Constitutionally protected right to keep and bear arms, why did they turn tail and allow all those unconstitutional gun control laws to be enacted? Or, perhaps we should ask: Why is there no punishment for those lawmakers, judges and bureaucrats who knowingly and intentionally violate the Constitution? Are they now above our Constitution?

There is a very interesting story behind the federal Gun Control Act of 1968 which some people say smells a lot like the old Nazi gun control laws.

One popular gun rights group compared the text of the Nazi Weapons Law of 1938 with the U.S. Gun Control Act of 1968. As they report:

"Members of Jews for the Preservation of Firearms Ownership (JPFO) consider 'gun control' to be an aggressive cancer. JPFO has a cure, a way to destroy 'gun control'. JPFO has hard evidence that shows that the Nazi Weapons Law (March 18, 1938) is the source of the U.S. Gun Control Act of 1968 (GCA '68). Adolph Hitler signed the Nazi Weapons Law. The Gestapo (Nazi National Secret Police) enforced it. In 'Gun Control': Gateway to Tyranny we present the official German text of the Nazi Weapons Law and a side-by-side translation into English. Even more deadly: a side-by-side, section-by-

In the beginning of change the patriot is a scarce man, brave, hated and scorned. When his cause succeeds, however, the timid join him, for then it costs nothing to be a patriot. -- Mark Twain

section comparison of the GCA '68 with the Nazi Weapons Law. If you have this in your hands, no one can tell you that you're imagining things."

JPFO is hopping mad about this, as we all should be. They present evidence and name the names of those in government who spearheaded this treacherous nonsense. Some people named are still on Capitol Hill. For a great outline of the story (and names), visit the JPFO web site. If you are interested in Constitutional issues and your right as an American to keep and bear arms, you will find this page very interesting.

Then comes the problem: How do we correct it?

Gun Permit Funds at Issue

Revelations that Kanawha County, W.Va., Sheriff Dave Tucker used public money from concealed weapons permits to buy tepees and costumes for his department might prompt the Legislature to tighten controls on how the permit funds are used.

In 2003, records showed that Tucker spent about \$40,000 from the permit fund to buy a truck for his bomb squad, \$4,000 for badges and \$2,000 for sweaters. He also bought 25 underwater dive watches for more than \$2,500 and nine sweaters for more than \$1,000.

Sheriff's departments took control of the weapons permits funds in 1995 after a state Supreme Court decision. Until then, circuit courts had been issuing concealed weapons permits, but the Supreme Court said that overstepped the role of the judiciary.

The Legislature gave the responsibility to sheriffs departments and allowed the departments to charge a fee because of the increased workload.

Kanawha County Commissioner Dave Hardy has urged the Legislature to give commissioners more oversight power.

Hardy said, "We've had the odd sheriff this time, but there are 54 other counties that might one day have one just like him."

-- Charleston *Daily Mail*, Dec. 20, 2004

Ed: In 1943 the U.S. Supreme court ruled that government cannot license a right and charge a fee for it (*Murdoch v. Pennsylvania* 319 US 105). But W. Va. sheriffs; legislators, Supreme Court judges, circuit court judges and county commissioners still haven't got the word.

The Plot to Kill Us All

By John Kaminski

"Depleted uranium: Dirty bombs, dirty missiles, dirty bullets - A death sentence here and abroad" (<http://www.sfbayview.com/081804/Depleteduranium081804.shtml>) sketches as bleak a tableau as we can face in our modern world, but one that is absolutely essential for us to know if we are to survive as a species.

Leuren Moret, a former Lawrence Livermore Lab scientist, works with a group of independent scientists called the Radiation and Public Health Project. Altogether the group has written ten books on the health effects of low level radiation.

There can be little doubt that the low level radiation emitted by depleted uranium ammunition is designed to kill not only large numbers of people in nations the U.S. has decided to conquer, but our own soldiers as well. What's more, our government, which professes to love its military men and women, knows it kills them.

Moret writes: And what about our soldiers? Terry Jemison of the Department of Veterans Affairs reported this week to the *American Free Press* that "Gulf-era veterans" now on medical disability since 1991 number 518,739, with only 7,035 reported wounded in Iraq in that same 14-year period. *American Free Press* reported that eight out of 20 men who served in one unit in the 2003 U.S. military offensive in Iraq now have malignancies. That means that 40 percent of the soldiers in that unit have developed malignancies in just 16 months. This is an astonishing war crime being conducted against our own soldiers, and not a peep about it from Dan Rather or The *New York Times*.

-- <http://www.rense.com>

Ed.: Depleted uranium is what is left over when most of the highly radioactive types (isotopes) of uranium are removed for use as nuclear fuel or nuclear weapons. Depleted uranium is used in armor-piercing munitions and in enhanced armor protection for some Abrams tanks. DU is used both as tank armor, and in armor-piercing shells known as depleted uranium penetrators. Over 15 countries are known to have depleted uranium weapons in their military arsenals - US, UK, France, Russia, Greece, Turkey, Israel, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Egypt, Kuwait, Pakistan, Thailand, Iraq and Taiwan.

Forget about Terrorists; Feds Target Americans

WASHINGTON (AP) - More than 7,000 people who should have been barred from buying guns were able to buy them anyway in 2002 and 2003, according to the Justice Department.

Federal law stipulates that gun buyers might have to wait up to three business days before receiving their weapons; under a system of instant FBI background checks instituted in 1998, most sales are approved much quicker. Of the 17 million gun purchases in the last two years, 122,000 were denied because of the checks.

If the background check isn't completed within the period, the law says the purchase must go through. In 2002 and 2003, there were a combined 7,030 "delayed denial" cases in which the FBI found that a prohibited person was able to get a gun after the period expired, according to the review by Glenn A. Fine, the Justice Department's inspector general.

The study also found that federal prosecutors brought charges in only 154 of the 122,000 illegal purchase cases.

Many U.S. attorneys believe cases are difficult to bring to a jury, the review said, partly because a denial can occur because of seemingly minor offenses that happened long ago. Examples include a man who had stolen a pig in 1941, a person convicted of check forgery in 1959 and someone with an attempted burglary conviction dating to 1963.

The three-day waiting period for buying weapons, established by Congress in 1993 in the Brady Act, was meant to ensure that fugitives, people convicted of past crimes, illegal aliens, people involved in domestic violence, drug addicts and others cannot buy guns from federally licensed dealers. Those dealers are required to submit forms to the FBI's National Instant Criminal Background Check System before any weapon can be bought.

ATF is seeking more money from Congress for its firearms investigations.

Mary Beth Buchanan, director of the Executive Office for U.S. Attorneys, said federal prosecutors have been instructed to ensure their guidelines reflect a June 2001 directive from Attorney General John Ashcroft, which mandated that gun background check violations be

considered a priority for law enforcement.

Wash Up, Baldy

Treating hair with caffeine products can stop men from going bald, according to a new German study.

Professor Peter Elsnert of Jena University said that the stimulant has the most effect on men whose hair roots were very sensitive to testosterone, one of the causes of hair loss.

But the research does not mean that coffee drinkers will be spared a bald head in later life, only those who smear it directly on their heads.

Adolf Klenk of Kurt Wolff cosmetic research said: "One would have to drink between 60 and 80 cups of coffee a day for the necessary amount of caffeine to reach the roots."

He said that men who are frightened that they may lose their hair should start treating their scalps with caffeine while they are still young.

-- www.ananova.com

Is America Dying?

By Scott D. O'Reilly

At America's founding, a woman stopped to ask Benjamin Franklin what kind of government we would soon have. "A republic, madam" he replied. "If you can keep it."

As historian Gore Vidal notes, Franklin was certain that America's grand experiment would someday end in tyranny.

Though America is not yet tyrannous, the past four years have ushered in some ominous trends: one hijacked election; a radical right cabal that controls all three branches of government; journalists facing prison time for not divulging their sources; and an administration that has demonstrated a selective disregard for the Constitution, international laws and agreements, not to mention "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind."

That the American people, by a slim margin, essentially endorsed the administration's course in 2004 is discouraging but not surprising; civilizations and societies have frequently embraced disastrous leaders in times of strife, danger, and challenge. If the past is prologue, the future portends many perils.

The historian Arnold Toynbee studied the life cycle of civilizations. Of the roughly two-dozen great civilizations --Sumerian, Egyptian, Greek, Roman, Inca etc. -- all but our

present Western civilization has met its fate. Toynbee argues that civilizations flower, mature, and ultimately disintegrate because they fail to address challenges in creative and constructive ways.

For Toynbee, the challenges stem from the dynamics between three factions: an internal ruling class or elite, a largely ignorant internal proletariat, and an external "barbarian" proletariat.

Think of the Bush administration as the ruling elite; the fundamentalists in the heartland as the internal proletariat; and al-Qaeda as the disaffected "barbarian" at the gate, trained as anti-communist "freedom fighters" by their old masters from the Reagan/Bush administration.

Toynbee contends there are two ways civilizations can meet the challenges from the threats they've had a hand in creating: internally and spiritually or externally and physically. What does Toynbee mean? Well, imagine that in response to 9/11 America had a crash program to develop alternative fuels, ecological efficiency, and energy independence so that the United States no longer depended on supporting oppressive and corrupt Middle Eastern regimes to insure the flow of cheap oil. America could have, in short order, undermined al-Qaeda's reason for existence.

Making energy conservation and alternative fuel development a national security issue would, in Toynbee's framework, be an internal and spiritual approach to the external threat America faces. The Bush administration, however, has taken precisely the opposite tack, preferring to meet the challenge of al-Qaeda by purely physical and external means -- emphasizing military measures and the invasion of Iraq.

Like Sparta, which ossified with each military victory, America has created a no-win situation in Iraq -- where each time an insurgency in one part of country is crushed, resistance to the occupation grows in the rest of Iraq -- to say nothing of the broader resentment it fuels in the Middle East.

The pattern of petrification -- where challenges are met with stereotypical reactions that are increasingly unproductive -- is a sure sign for Toynbee that a civilization is on a downward course. Curiously, the starker the challenges and the less effective the responses to those challenges, the more conservative the body politic becomes.

Invariably, religious fundamentalist movements sweep the

domestic proletariat, a fact easily exploited by the ruling elites. Decline does not happen overnight. Even after the Visigoths sacked Rome, the disintegration of a civilization took centuries. And it is always a tragedy. The barbarians that laid waste to Rome offered no positive contribution to humanity, nor would a Taliban-like state promoted by al-Qaeda represent any kind of advancement.

There is saying -- I believe it originated with Hegel: "The wings of Minerva spread only at dusk," the notion being that we cannot know the meaning of an historical era until that age has past. And so it is with the American age, which still has the opportunity of avoiding the perils of empires past if only she would recognize that she is not immune to the foibles of history.

-- Intervention Magazine

Apocalypse Now

By Gerald Rellick

In a speech at Harvard Medical School, Bill Moyers lamented the twisted views of many people who subscribe to the fundamentalist doctrine of the Apocalypse and the related Rapture, which concepts, writes Moyers, "[are] rather simple, if bizarre...."

"Once Israel has occupied the rest of its 'biblical lands', legions of the anti-Christ will attack it, triggering a final showdown in the valley of Armageddon. As the Jews who have not been converted are burned, the Messiah will return for the Rapture. True believers will be lifted out of their clothes and transported to heaven, where, seated next to the right hand of God, they will watch their political and religious opponents suffer plagues of boils, sores, locusts, and frogs during the several years of tribulation that follow."

Moyers continues: "I'm not making this up. I've reported on these people, following some of them from Texas to the West Bank. They are sincere, serious, and polite as they tell you they feel called to help bring the Rapture on as fulfillment of biblical prophecy. That's why they have declared solidarity with Israel and the Jewish settlements and backed up their support with money and volunteers. It's why the invasion of Iraq for them was a warm-up act, predicted in the Book of Revelations.... A war with Islam in the Middle East is not something to be feared but welcomed -- an essential conflagration on the road to redemption."

And there is official support in Washington for these views. According

to an article by Glenn Scherer in *Grist*, House Majority Leader Tom Delay -- a self-declared member of the Christian Zionists, an End-Time faction numbering 20 million Americans -- was present at John Hagee's San Antonio-based Cornerstone Church in 2002 when Hagee preached a fire and brimstone sermon, telling his congregation, "The war between America and Iraq is the gateway to the Apocalypse." After Hagee's sermon, Delay was quoted as saying, "Ladies and gentlemen, what has been spoken here tonight is the truth from God."

Then and Now

"For in principal, there is no difference between a law prohibiting the wearing of concealed arms, and a law forbidding the wearing such as exposed; and if the former be unconstitutional, the latter must be so likewise. But it should not be forgotten, that it is not only that it secured by the constitution; it is the right entire and complete, as it existed at the adoption of the constitution; and if any portion of that right be impaired, immaterial how small the part may be, and immaterial the order at the time at which it is done, it is equally forbidden by the constitution." (1822: *Bliss v. Commonwealth* 12 Ky. (2 Litt.) 90 at 92 and 93, 13 Am. Dec 251)

"The right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed. The right of the whole people, old and young, men, women and boys, and not militia only, to keep and bear arms of every description, and not such merely as used by the militia, shall not be infringed, curtailed, or broken in upon in the smallest degree; and all this for the important end to be attained: the rearing up and qualifying a well-regulated militia, so vitally necessary to the to the security of a free State. Our opinion is that any law, State or Federal, is repugnant to the Constitution, and void which contravenes this right" (1846: *Nunn vs. State*, 1 Ga. (1 Kel.) 243 at 251)

"The right to arms is not a right granted by the Constitution. Neither is it in any manner dependent on that instrument for its existence." (1876: *U.S. v Cruikshank* 92 US 542)

"The maintenance of the right to bear arms is a most essential one to every free people and should not be whittled down by technical constructions." (1921: *State vs. Kerner* 181 N.C. 574, 107 S.E. 222 at 224)

Terrorism in USA?

The Presbyterian Church (USA)'s decision to divest from companies profiting from the Israeli occupation of the West Bank and Gaza may turn into fire -- literally. On Nov. 12, the PCUSA reported that an anonymous writer sent a letter from Queens, NY, threatening to burn down Presbyterian churches in retaliation for "your anti-Israel and anti-Jewish attitudes."

The handwritten letter -- which according to the Presbyterian News Service has an illustration of a swastika -- set a Nov. 15 deadline for the denomination to reverse its Middle East policies "or else."

"I promise violence against Presbyterian Churches -- They will go up in flames, bet your ass that's a terrorist threat," the letter stated.

Officials at the Presbyterian Church headquarter notified federal authorities of the threat

Meanwhile, the PCUSA head Clifton Kirkpatrick immediately offered several safety precautions.

Suggestions stretched from illuminating building exteriors, entrances, and parking lots, to installing burglar and fire alarm systems that transmit a message.

Kirkpatrick's letter was also sent to all denominational offices in the nation.

"Though the threat appeared to have come from New York, we can't be sure, so we've contacted them (governing bodies) all," said Gradye Parsons, director of operations for the Office of the General Assembly.

Meanwhile, Kirkpatrick offered some words of assurance for the 2.5-million member denomination, saying, "The overwhelming majority of these kinds of threats never come to fruition."

"At the same time," Kirkpatrick added, "it is helpful to be aware and prepared."

-- christianpost.com, Nov. 12, 2004

The Bible and Gun Control

I have written a book entitled "The Bible and Gun Control." This book proves gun ownership is a Biblical, God-given right. For example, Christ encourages his disciples to sell a coat and "buy a sword" for self defense. (See Luke 22:35-38.)

The book's purpose is to educate evangelicals on their Biblical right and responsibility of self defense against criminals and tyrannical governments. The American Revolution also speaks to this issue. Without the free access to personal weapons there could have been no revolution. This war

was fought mainly by Christians and their pastors. George Washington said, "Call this war by whatever name you may; only call it not an American rebellion, it is nothing more or less than a Scotch-Irish-Presbyterian rebellion."

The pastor's involvement is revealed by an extensive quote (p. 46-48) proving ministers went into their pulpits with their guns and urged their congregations to go to war.

The Bible and the American Revolution both speak against gun control. If you are an evangelical or know of one, this is a book you must read. Christians need to know the Biblical and historical facts on their right to self defense, so they will be conscience-bound to become involved in the fight against gun control. This book is useful and interesting for both Christian and non-Christian alike. It is a must for every patriot. "The Bible and Gun Control" sells for \$10 US including postage and handling and can be purchased by mailing a cheque or cash to: John S Winter 11 John St. S., Apt. 404 Mississauga, Ontario, Canada, L5H 2E3 Email: jswinter@primus.ca Phone: 905-274-1992

The Remington 260 Cartridge

By Don Lewis, Outdoors Writer

It's not my policy to advocate a particular rifle or cartridge for deer hunting, but I don't have any reservations about suggesting a deer hunting cartridge: the 260 Remington.

Most female hunters and young hunters select the Winchester 243 cartridge because of its low recoil. There's nothing wrong with that. The 105 grain bullet in a 243 case is adequate for deer even at ranges beyond 150 yards. I'm certainly not against the 243 or any of the 6mm. cartridges. I favor a heavier bullet.

The 6mm caliber (.243) is limited to bullet weights of 105 grains or lower. The 260 Remington (264 caliber) starts at 120 grains and can effectively use 140-grain bullets. A 105-grain 243 bullet has a top muzzle velocity of around 2,650 feet per second (fps). This is plenty of velocity, but the hunter must select a bullet designed for big game. Lighter bullet weights in the 243 are normally meant for varmint shooting and will not retain sufficient lead for deep penetration.

The 260 Remington's bullets are genuine deer stoppers. The 120-grain bullet generates a muzzle velocity up to 2,900 fps and the 140-grain can reach the 2,700 fps mark. It's evident that the 260 is more than a match for

the 243 although it is not nearly as popular.

From a recoil standpoint, I doubt if there is really much difference between the two cartridges. I'm sure the 260 kicks a little harder, but it's not even close the category of the 30-06 or even the 25-06.

I'm not downgrading the 243 or any of the 6mm cartridges, but the 260 Remington is a tough customer to beat. It not only works well in the big game woods, it's a fairly good varmint cartridge. However, the 120-grain bullet is too large for smaller varmints like prairie dogs and woodchucks.

Remington's Model SEVEN bolt action rifle is an ideal choice for the 260 Remington.

The model SEVEN is compact and easy to carry. I use a model SEVEN chambered for the Remington 7mm-08. It's light in weight and compact enough to get through thick vegetation without struggling. Mag Na Porting (installing a muzzle brake) the barrel will reduce recoil by 40 to 50 percent.

There are other types of muzzle brakes that will cut recoil significantly. With a good muzzle brake, the 260's recoil is similar to a 22-250 varmint cartridge. I have a muzzle brake on the Model Seven, and its recoil is about the same as a 243.

-- PittsburghLIVE.com, Dec. 3, 2004

Ed.: Lewis' advice applies to states where deer are hunted with rifles. The only firearm Jersey deer hunters use is the shotgun.

Fourth Amendment Protects All Citizens

By Timothy Lynch

Few people seem to like the Fourth Amendment to the American Constitution. The Fourth Amendment is the provision that places limits on the power of the police to detain and search people.

The unpopularity of the constitutional provision is perhaps understandable because it's usually mentioned in the news only when a court declares that a police raid on a drug dealer's apartment was

unconstitutional. In the minds of many Americans, the Fourth Amendment only seems to benefit criminals.

The Fourth Amendment has gotten a bad wrap. The Founding Fathers understood that a free society necessarily requires that the power of government to detain, interrogate and search must be limited. It is a pity that so many Americans give the Fourth Amendment an adolescent—"What's the big deal?"—shrug that runs something like this: I've never been searched or arrested and never will be since I'm not doing anything illegal. Such a view misses the point. It is not so much how many times a person benefits from the Fourth Amendment that matters. Rather, the key point is that this constitutional safeguard will be there when you need it.

Just ask Mary Ann and James Stumbo. One day, seemingly out of the blue, a social worker knocked on the door of their home. This bureaucrat not only demanded that she be allowed to enter the house, but she also announced her intention to interrogate the Stumbo children in private. The Stumbos were taken aback by all this because they were certain they had done nothing wrong. When the social worker admitted that she had no search warrant, the Stumbos told her to leave, and closed the door. They were not about to let this impertinent stranger speak to their children at all, much less outside of their presence.

The matter didn't end there. The social worker returned with a court order that instructed the Stumbos not to "interfere" with the ongoing "investigation." The Stumbos believed that if government agents did not have a warrant, they could refuse them entrance, but now the government was calling that "obstruction of justice." Of course, the Stumbos could have surrendered to the demands after they finally discovered what had prompted the "investigation." Someone had apparently called the Department of Social Services after spotting their two-year-old on the driveway, naked, on a warm summer day. That was the "incident" that set the legal process in

motion.

The Stumbos were still appalled by the overzealous reaction to that telephone complaint and they did not appreciate the government's bullying tactics—so they retained a lawyer to defend their constitutional rights. They took their case all the way to the Supreme Court of North Carolina. That court determined that it was the social worker's demands, not the conduct of the Stumbos, that was unlawful. It was an important legal victory, but one that received scant attention outside of North Carolina.

When the police do not have an arrest warrant or a search warrant, they often try to get people to "consent" to questioning—so that when the detention is later challenged in court they can say, "It's true we had no warrant, but this detention was voluntary."

The Founding Fathers believed in the axiom that power tends to corrupt, but this is something that modern Americans tend to forget. Far from honoring the constitutional rights of the people, we are increasingly seeing our federal and state governments mischaracterize our rights as "crimes." Unless Americans wake up and better appreciate the Fourth Amendment, this trend will eventually win the day and trample the Stumbos of future generations.

As Judge Learned Hand warned many years ago, "Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women; if it dies there, no constitution, no law, no court can save it."

-- Timothy Lynch is the director of the Project on Criminal Justice at the [Cato Institute](http://CatoInstitute.org).

* * *

Police officers in Louisiana no longer need a search or arrest warrant to conduct a brief search of your home or business. (*United States v. Kelly Gould*, No. 0230629cr0, March 24, 2004, 5th Circuit Court of Appeals)

NJM, P.O. Box 10176, Trenton New Jersey 08650

ISSN 1523-4657

www.njmilitia.org

info@njmilitia.org

walnor@keepandbeararms.com

Middlesex County, Art (732) 607-0833

Wake Co, NC, Dave (919) 363-9410

Morris County, Bill (973) 361-3241

Johnson County, TX, Earl (817) 866-3288

Newsletter Subscription - Donation \$10.00

Cash or Blank Money Order Only

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State ____ Zip _____